APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,092	10/12/2000	Andrew E. Blau	CA9-1998-0006	9550

7590   09/24/2003

David A. Mims, Jr.
International Business Machines Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Department
Internal Zip 4054, 11400 Burnet Road
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER
CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/687,092		BLAU ET AL.	
		Examiner		Art Unit	
		Truc T Chuong		2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to Amendment B, filed 06/27/03.

2.   Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11-13, 18, 28, and 29 are

independent claims. In Amendment B, claims 1-30 are amended. This action is made final.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: missing a period at the

end of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.   .

5.   Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes (U.S.

Patent No. 6,275,223 B1) in view of Mueller (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,390).

As to claim 1, Hughes teaches a method for managing compiler error messages,

comprising the steps of:

displaying a compiler error message to a user (error in the code, col. 15 lines 19-43);

accepting from said user an annotation to said compiler error message (col. 6 lines 1-4);

associating said annotation with said compiler error message using a unique key and

storing said annotation (identifying a line number and storing annotation data, col. 5 lines 42-47);

and

thereafter selectively displaying said annotation with said compiler error message (col. 14

lines 52-57 and fig. 18);

however, Hughes does not clearly show a compiler error message having a separate

empty error file. Mueller teaches this limitation (Error List, col. 5 lines 32-54 and figs. 2-3). It

would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art

would want to have the Error List file of Mueller in to Hughes's annotation data to allow users to

easily find and edit specific errors in the file (col. 7 lines 11-62).

As to claim 2, Hughes teaches the method of claim 1, said selectively displaying step

further comprising the steps of:

displaying with said compiler error message indicia representing the existence of said

annotation (annotation data exist, col. 13 lines 52-56);

selectively receiving from said user a request to display said annotation (col. 13 lines 52-

56, col. 14 lines 52-57, and fig. 18); and

displaying said annotation with said compiler error message (fig. 18).

As to claim 3, Hughes teaches the method of claim 1, said accepting step further

comprising the steps of:

selectively presenting to said user an edit panel (col. 14 lines 7-57); and

receiving from said user said annotation input associated with said compiler error

message to said edit panel (fig. 18).

As to claim 4, Hughes teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

selecting a compiler error message having, a first key from a first file of compiler error

messages for display to said user; and associating in a second file said annotation to [a

corresponding] said selected compiler error using a second key message in said first file

(annotation data and matching the line numbers of the original source code and the new source

code, col. 3 lines 58-67, and col. 13 lines 52-60).

As to claim 5, Hughes teaches the method of claim 4, further comprising the steps of:

providing compiler error message identifying indicia for each compiler error message in

said first file;

generating annotation identifying indicia as a function of said compiler error message

identifying indicia (col. 13 line 52-col. 14 line 52).

As to claim 6, Hughes teaches the method of claim 4, further comprising the steps of

upon presenting a compiler error message from said first file, determining the presence of

a corresponding annotation in said second file using said second key (col. 14 lines 47-57);

responsive to the presence of said corresponding annotation, displaying with said

compiler, error message indicia representing the existence of said annotation (problem or

comment, col. 14 lines 52-57);

selectively receiving from said user a request to display said annotation (activating, col.

14 lines 48-49); and

responsive to receiving the request from said user, displaying said annotation with said

compiler error message using said second key (col. 14 lines 43-57, and figs. 15, 17-18).

As to claim 7, Hughes teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

during processing of application code entered by a user, identifying [an] a compiler error

in said code (col. 6 lines 20-21);

selecting and presenting to said user [an] a compiler error message [corresponding to said

error] (col. 15 lines 8-18);

identifying and presenting to said user an annotation corresponding to said compiler error

message (col. 4 lines 1-11); and

enabling and selectively receiving [an] said annotation and a modified annotation from

said user for association with said compiler error message (col. 14 lines 52-57 and fig. 18).

As to claim 8, Hughes teaches the method of claim 7, further comprising the steps of:

preserving a history of compiler error messages presented to said user (col. 6 lines 22-

23);

enabling user selection for one of [an] said compiler error messages from said history of

compiler error messages (col. 13 lines 22-36); and

selectively receiving from said user an annotation to the compiler error message selected

from said history (col. 14 lines 22-36).

As to claim 9, Hughes teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of

presenting said annotation to other users receiving said compiler error message (communicate

over the Network, col. 14 lines 22-26).

As to claim 10, Hughes inherently teaches the method of claim 4, further comprising the

step of enabling access by other users to said second file containing said annotations associated

with said compiler error messages because Hughes's workstations are communicated over the

Network (col. 14 lines 20-25), and second code display window 1502 (col. 12 lines 23-37) of fig. 15 can be viewed and controlled throughout the Network.

As to claim 11, it is individually similar in scope to claim 1 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 12, this is a system claim of method claim 1. Note the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claim 13, Hughes teaches a system for presenting compiler error messages in a user display, comprising:

a first file for storing a plurality of compiler error messages, each said compiler error message identified by a message key (col. 6 lines 22-23);

a second file for storing a plurality of annotations, each said annotation associated with a corresponding one of said compiler error messages (col. 4 lines 27-29, col. 14 lines 1-25 and fig. 16);

a first event driven control component for selecting from said first file and displaying a [display] compiler error message from said first file [for presentation] in said user display (col.14 lines 27-36);

a second event driven control component for determining the presence in said second file of an annotation associated with said displayed compiler error message (col.14 lines 19-21); and

a third event driven control component for displaying using a unique key said associated annotation in said user display (col. 14 lines 40-57, identifying a line number and storing annotation data, col. 5 lines 42-47).

. As to claim 14, Hughes teaches the system of claim 13, further comprising a fourth control component responsive to entry in said user display of a [message] annotation to a displayed compiler error message, for adding said [message] annotation to said second file using a unique key associated with said displayed compiler error message (edit annotation window, col. 14 lines 52-57 and fig. 18).

As to claim 15, Hughes teaches the system of claim 14, further comprising an editor for receiving via an annotation panel in said user display said [message] annotation (edit annotation window, col. 14 lines 52-57 and fig. 18).

As to claims 16 and 17, these are computer program product claims of claim 1. Note the rejections of claim 1 above.

As to claim 18, this is a computer program product claim of system claim 12. Note the rejection of claim 12 above.

As to claims 19-30, these are computer program product claims of method claims 2-11 and 13-14. Note the rejections of claims 2-11 and 13-14 above respectively.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

   Eick (U.S. Patent No. 644,692) teaches annotations, error messages, log files, and

debugging tools (cols. 2-37 and figs. 3-19).

   Wimble (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,850) teaches GUI, debugging system, error

messages, log files, and tracing codes (cols. 3-25 and figs. 3-18).

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

   Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Truc T. Chuong
09/15/03

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100